UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

WANDA E. MARTINEZ,

Plaintiff,

-against-

VERIZON,

Defendant.

USDC SDNY DOCUMENT ELECTRONICALLY FILED DOC #:_____ DATE FILED:__12/18/2019__

19-CV-11129 (VEC)
ORDER OF SERVICE

VALERIE CAPRONI, United States District Judge:

Plaintiff, appearing *pro se*, brings this action under the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the Family and Medical Leave Act, and New York City and New York State civil rights laws. By order dated December 12, 2019, the Court granted Plaintiff's request to proceed without prepayment of fees, that is, *in forma pauperis*.

Because Plaintiff has been granted permission to proceed IFP, he is entitled to rely on the Court and the U.S. Marshals Service to effect service. *Walker v. Schult*, 717 F.3d. 119, 123 n.6 (2d Cir. 2013); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d) ("The officers of the court shall issue and serve all process . . . in [IFP] cases."); Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(c)(3) (the court must order the Marshals Service to serve if the plaintiff is authorized to proceed IFP)). Although Rule 4(m) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure generally requires that the summons and complaint be served within 90 days of the date the complaint is filed, Plaintiff is proceeding IFP and could not have served the summons and complaint until the Court reviewed the complaint and ordered that a summons be issued. The Court therefore extends the time to serve until 90 days after the date the summons is issued. If the complaint is not served within that time, Plaintiff should request an extension of time for service. *See Meilleur v. Strong*, 682 F.3d 56, 63 (2d Cir. 2012) (holding that it is the plaintiff's responsibility to request an extension of time for service); *see also Murray v. Pataki*,

378 F. App'x 50, 52 (2d Cir. 2010) ("As long as the [plaintiff proceeding IFP] provides the

information necessary to identify the defendant, the Marshals' failure to effect service

automatically constitutes 'good cause' for an extension of time within the meaning of Rule

4(m).").

To allow Plaintiff to effect service on Defendant Verizon through the U.S. Marshals

Service, the Clerk of Court is instructed to fill out a U.S. Marshals Service Process Receipt and

Return form (USM-285 form) for this defendant. The Clerk of Court is further instructed to issue

a summons and deliver to the Marshals Service all the paperwork necessary for the Marshals

Service to effect service upon this defendant.

Plaintiff must notify the Court in writing if his address changes, and the Court may

dismiss the action if Plaintiff fails to do so.

CONCLUSION

The Clerk of Court is directed to mail a copy of this order to Plaintiff, together with an

information package.

The Clerk of Court is further instructed to complete the USM-285 form with the

addresses for Verizon and deliver all documents necessary to effect service to the U.S. Marshals

Service.

SO ORDERED.

Dated:

December 17, 2019

New York, New York

VALERIE CAPRONI

United States District Judge

2

DEFENDANT AND SERVICE ADDRESS

Verizon 105-15 70th Road Forest Hills, New York 11375